

he and I disagree that there would be a majority of votes for H.R. 15. It is a reflection of the comprehensive Senate bill, and I don't believe we have a majority in this House for that bill.

I would furthermore ask the gentleman whether he thinks—or I would just say that perhaps it would be more constructive that we sit down and begin to talk about where we can go in a direction that we have in common, that we feel that we can agree on things rather than differences; rather than filing discharge petitions, perhaps it would be a little more constructive to sit down, instead of demanding our way or the highway.

Again, too much of that has been the way this town has worked over the last several years, and it is unfortunate.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He and I have a difference of opinion. We discussed this the last time, as I recall. We have a difference of opinion. He thinks it would not pass. I think it would pass.

The good news for America is there is a very easy way to determine who is right and who is wrong. Put the bill on the floor, give the House a vote, give America a vote. If I am wrong, I will stand up on the floor of the House and say I was wrong.

I am sure that my friend, the majority leader, will do the same if, in fact, he is wrong, but we have an easy way in America to resolve such differences because we all have differences of opinion.

In a democracy, you vote. In a democracy, you resolve differences by coming together. I look forward to sitting down with the gentleman on this issue. I would reiterate I look forward to dealing with him on other issues as we have been able to do in many instances. I thank him for that opportunity.

We can resolve this difference by simply bringing the bill to the floor, giving America a vote, and letting the House work its will. Unless the gentleman wants to say something further, I yield back the balance of my time.

--- **HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW**

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow; and when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, April 1, 2014, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAMALFA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

--- **HONORING KIM RUBIN**

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extremely important person. Today marks 25 years that Kim Rubin has worked here on Capitol Hill.

In the 1980s, Kim Rubin accepted an internship with former Congressman Jack Kemp from her home State of New York. She has come a long way since then. She has been with me, I am proud to say, since day one that I served in the United States Congress.

I have never met anyone more loyal, more dependable, or more organized. Not only does Kim coordinate our office's schedule and those of our entire staff, she works diligently as our office manager.

Somehow, she still has the time and energy to be a dedicated wife to her loving husband, Howie, and also to her two beautiful daughters, Lexi and Livi. She is also a volleyball coach, and her nickname is Coach K.

As Kim says, her life is centered on faith, family, and pursuing what makes you happy. I don't know how Kim does it all, but it has been an honor to work with Kim Rubin for these past 8 years.

While we will part ways after we both retire this year, I know I will have a lifelong friend in the indomitable Kim Rubin.

Congratulations and thank you, Kim Rubin.

--- **FOREST MANAGEMENT**

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Endangered Species Act was signed into law in 1973, in order to preserve, protect, and recover key domestic species.

The ESA also contains a citizen lawsuit provision, which allows private citizens—and, in many cases, special interest organizations—to sue Federal agencies and private landowners for allegedly failing to comply with ESA. Taxpayers are on the hook, even when the Federal Government prevails.

The Forest Service, which I had the privilege of holding jurisdiction over as chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy, and Forestry, must comply with ESA before engaging in any kind of forest management activity, which is the agency's most basic and fundamental role.

Protecting species is our goal, but unfortunately, this provision has been used as a tool by those who would like to halt land management activities.

The financial impact of these activities in the Forest Service is significant, posing a threat to the forest health, the economic well-being of local communities, and also the species we are aiming to protect.

We must replace this flawed policy with one that protects taxpayers and species restoration, but also the health of our forests and our local economies.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize Members for Special Orders speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

--- **WEEK IN REVIEW**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a surprising twist today: Who says there is nothing surprising in Washington? We were told there was potential for a bill to come to the floor today to deal with the issue of the SGR, sustainable growth rate, or the doc fix, as it is sometimes called.

There has been some disagreement in our party what would be the best way to handle it. We had a bill. It was a 1-year extension, 1 year that included some other things that some of the people that are providing the care that haven't been properly treated in reimbursement areas we are not happy about.

So it appeared we didn't have—or our leaders may not have had the votes, and so it is quite a surprise that was voice-voted. No one asked for a recorded vote because normally, see, we trust our leaders that, if there is an important bill, that part of the leadership understand, someone here, part of the bill will request a recorded vote, and we will get a recorded vote, and we will all be able to either vote for or vote against.

Otherwise, we have to keep people here all the time, and it did bring back to mind the time that was not so fond back in 2007, 2008, sometimes 2009 and 2010, when on the first day back in Washington, whether it was a Monday or a Tuesday, the first day, there is suspension bills.

Those are bills that are expected to pass and have two-thirds of the body vote for them, naming courthouses, naming Federal buildings, recognizing some important person or deed, those type of things.

They are generally agreed to, and despite all the negativity in Washington, those are things that we agreed to constantly; and both sides of the aisle worked together getting it accomplished.

We saw very quickly, after Republicans lost the majority in November of 2006, sometimes Republican leadership would agree to allow some suspensions to go when it was extremely important. It should never have been brought to the floor on suspension, which means it doesn't go through subcommittee, it doesn't go through committee.

It just comes to the floor, without having gone through Rules Committee,

and that is why it takes two-thirds of a vote, because it bypassed the normal procedure.

There were a handful of us who decided back in 2007, since Republican leadership at that time were agreeing to things that we knew our other friends in the Republican side, some friends on the Democratic side would never vote for, if it was a recorded vote, where everyone had a chance to vote—I started flying back early. I know TOM PRICE did at times; LYNN WESTMORELAND did at times.

I got to where I was flying back, even if I thought somebody else was covering the floor. The reason was to make sure that, since we couldn't trust that our leadership would not agree to some bill that we thought was hurtful to the country, was hurtful to the Constitution or to our constituents, we had to be here to ask for a recorded vote.

It went unnoticed except by leadership staff on both sides, and it got to where, when I came to the floor and would sit here for 3 or 4 hours, I would have staff come up, usually Democratic staff, since they were in the majority, and say: Well, obviously, you are concerned about some issue.

Sometimes, I was just here to observe, to make sure nothing was brought to the floor without any notice. Sometimes, there was a particular suspension that I felt should have a recorded vote, so I would show up, and I would, after the voice vote, request a recorded vote.

That is why staff started coming up and saying: Look, which one are you going to demand a recorded vote on or are you going to object to?

Sometimes, I would get up and speak against the bill. It got to where if I had an objection, they knew—because I'd done it between the time of the call for a recorded vote—I would go back to my office; I would type up a notice on why a bill was not a good bill.

I would be standing at the door, get a few other people to stand at other doors to hand out little fliers to Members of Congress as they came to the floor explaining why it wasn't a good bill.

Sometimes, I won; sometimes, I lost, but all you had to get was one more then one-third of the votes to bring down a suspension. So we were able to deal with that issue and make sure that, you know, people knew if you are going to try to pull that stuff, we are going to have people sit here, so that you can't just pass something on a voice vote without it being called for a recorded vote.

I was very surprised today with us in the majority, our own leadership in charge, with something as important as the doctor fix would be brought to the floor on a voice vote.

I would have come over earlier, except it was in recess, back in session, recess, back in session. I didn't know how long the recesses were going to be, but now, I know that I need to get with some other Members and make sure we

have people on the floor, since we won't be sure what our own leadership is going to do.

That is very unfortunate. It is unfortunate. You need to be able to trust your own leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's, on another matter, very important that we note that this year's Margaret Sanger Award would go to former Speaker NANCY PELOSI.

I have an article here from American Thinker, dated yesterday. Jeannie DeAngelis wrote the article. I won't read the whole article, but it points out that any woman willing to call late term abortion "sacred ground" and make false accusations that the opposing political party voting for the Protect Life Act would leave pregnant women "dying on the floor" deserves an award named after eugenicist Margaret Sanger.

NANCY PELOSI will be given the Margaret Sanger Award, which Planned Parenthood considers its "highest honor."

Further down, it says:

A committed socialist, Margaret Sanger once said, "My own personal feelings drew me toward the individualist anarchist philosophy, but it seemed necessary to approach the idea by way the socialism," Sanger said.

□ 1315

She also said this:

This is the great day of social planning. We have come to believe in planning the production and distribution of goods. We plan methods of governing cities, States, and the Nation. We plan jobs and leisure time activities and vacations. We plan almost everything, big and little, except families.

Sanger goes on to say:

It can scarcely do any harm—and it may do a vast amount of good—to engage in the thoughtful planning of our population, a population with a still larger percentage of happy families.

An active worker for the Socialist Party, Sanger believed:

The more radical the ideas, the more conservative you must be in your dress.

Saul Alinsky said:

Dresses his crusades in vestments of morality.

The article says:

For Margaret Sanger, eugenics was an avenue to improve the human race by discouraging people with genetic defects or undesirable traits—Blacks, immigrants, and poor people—whom she called "human weeds, reckless breeders, spawning human beings who never should have been born."

Further down, it points out another irony, which is that Italian American NANCY PATRICIA D'ALESSANDRO PELOSI had grandparents named Maria and Tommaso, who immigrated to America from Italy. If Margaret Sanger had had her eugenic way with Maria Foppiani-Petronilla, Ms. PELOSI wouldn't be here, let alone be receiving an award.

In February of 1919, in the Birth Control Review, Sanger published an article entitled, "Birth Control and Racial Betterment."

In 1934, Sanger wrote an article entitled, "America Needs a Code for Ba-

bies: Plea for Equal Distribution of Births." Ms. Sanger's baby code said that people with bad genes, or dysgenic groups, should be given a choice between sterilization and segregation. Those who willingly chose sterilization should be rewarded by contributing to a superior race.

In article 6, Sanger suggested issuing parenthood permits that would be valid for no more than one birth.

Despite being lionized by socialist liberals, Margaret "every child a wanted child" Sanger's legacy is one of murder, racism, revulsion for the handicapped, intrinsic disgust for the male gender, and a form of twisted radicalism that viewed God-ordained marriage and the miracle of life with contempt.

Margaret Sanger's life was committed to curing what she viewed as the "urgent problem" of how to "limit and discourage the overfertility of the mentally and physically defective."

It should be noted that, in the past, our former Secretary of State, Secretary Clinton, received the same Margaret Sanger Award, who believed in eugenics, who believed it was a good thing to limit the births of races who, perhaps, were too poor, who she thought were dysgenic.

This article from, actually, March 31, 2009, Catholic Online, points out:

A day before receiving the Planned Parenthood Federation of America's highest honor, the Margaret Sanger Award, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton paid a visit to the basilica of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Mexico City, leaving a bouquet of white flowers "on behalf of the American people."

When leaving the basilica a half an hour later, Secretary Clinton told some of the Mexicans who were gathered outside to greet her, "You have a marvelous virgin."

The following day, Friday, March 27, Clinton was in Houston to receive the Margaret Sanger Award, named for the organization's founder, a noted eugenicist. Secretary Clinton, according to a State Department transcript of Secretary Clinton's remarks, said this:

I admire Margaret Sanger enormously—her courage, her tenacity, her vision. When I think about what she did all those years ago in Brooklyn, taking on archetypes, taking on attitudes and accusations flowing from all directions, I am really in awe of her.

Another article points out, from The Weekly Standard, April 15, 2009, that Secretary Clinton stands by her praise of eugenicist Margaret Sanger.

Secretary Clinton points out:

Now, I have to tell you that it was a great privilege when I was told I would receive this award. I admire Margaret Sanger enormously—her courage, her tenacity, her vision.

It is probably worth looking at exactly what Margaret Sanger stood for since she is so admired by our former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who could end up being President, and our former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI. Let's look at exactly what Margaret Sanger said. Here are some quotes from Margaret Sanger.

The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.

That is Margaret Sanger. That is Margaret Sanger, whose name adorns

an award that was so revered by Secretary Clinton and now by our former Speaker PELOSI. It is unbelievable that anybody would be held in high esteem who would make that statement:

The most merciful thing that the large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it.

For heaven's sake. That is not all. She had plenty more to say.

We should apply a stern and rigid policy of sterilization and segregation to that grade of population whose progeny is tainted or whose inheritance is such that objectionable traits may be transmitted to offspring.

That was from "A Plan for Peace," from the Birth Control Review in April of 1932. The first quote I read was "Woman and the New Race" from chapter 6, "The Wickedness of Creating Large Families."

Then from "America Needs a Code for Babies," in March of 1934, article 1:

The purpose of the American baby code shall be to provide for a better distribution of babies and to protect society against the propagation and increase of the unfit.

You see, it is important to note here that what this kind of code does is say that we need a governing body that will decide who they think is fit and who they think is unfit. Gee, how about that? In ObamaCare, we have a panel that will decide. You get a pacemaker. You don't get a pacemaker. We know your hip is giving you a lot of pain, but you are just not worth a new hip. Do you need a new knee? Ah, we have looked at your life, and we have looked at your age. You don't get a new knee. You just suffer and die.

I mean, it is unbelievable that a bill would pass that sets up a board that will decide who can get a pacemaker to allow him to live and who will not, who will get the lifesaving medication and who will not. I don't want an insurance company making that decision, and I don't want the government making that decision. I had a bill that would have avoided that kind of thing, but of course, it didn't come to the floor when Democrats were in the majority. They brought, instead, ObamaCare, setting up that board.

Let's go back to quotes from Margaret Sanger.

Article 4, from her "America Needs a Code for Babies," says:

No woman shall have the legal right to bear a child—and no man shall have the right to become a father—without a permit.

Hey, there is good news. All you have to do is be politically ingratiated enough with the government under Margaret Sanger's code and they will give you a permit to have a baby, because they will consider you fit. Chances are, if you are of an opposing political view of those who are handing out the permits, you won't get a permit because you may have a child that disagrees with the people handing out the permits.

It quotes article 6:

No permit for parenthood shall be valid for more than one birth.

This was Margaret Sanger.

She also said, in 1932, in the April Birth Control Review:

Give dysgenic groups—that's people with bad genes—in our population their choice of segregation or compulsory sterilization.

In 1922, she said:

Birth control must lead, ultimately, to a cleaner race.

Gee, the Nazis were pretty good about pushing a cleaner race, but thank God they were completely wrong about the White superhuman race. I always loved that about Jesse Owens. He went there, to the heart of the Nazis, and showed them they were wrong about their superhuman race, and yet here we have a woman, Margaret Sanger, being held in such great, high esteem, who thinks we need a cleaner race, according to her whims.

Here is another quote from the esteemed Margaret Sanger. This is from "The Need for Birth Control in America." It is quoted by Angela Franks:

Such parents swell the pathetic ranks of the unemployed. Feeble-mindedness perpetuates itself from the ranks of those who are blandly indifferent to their racial responsibilities, and it is largely this type of humanity we are now drawing upon to populate our world for the generations to come. In this orgy of multiplying and replenishing the Earth, this type is *pari passu* multiplying and perpetuating those direct evils in which we must, if civilization is to survive, extirpate by the very roots.

Here is another quote. This is from "Family Limitation," Margaret Sanger's eighth edition, in 1918:

Women of the working class, especially wage workers, should not have more than two children at most. The average working man can support no more, and the average working woman can take care of no more in decent fashion.

So that is Margaret Sanger. She is there to tell the world repeatedly that we need a government that will restrict the feeble-minded or maybe, according to her, these disgusting women who work for wages. Ah, we can't let them have many children. Yet some have the nerve to say that Republicans have a war on women when you look at the heroine of the left, and she was for eugenics. She was a racist. She was a classist—a divider—who wanted and thought the best thing a large family could do was to kill a baby. We consider her a hero?

Forbid it, Almighty God.

I know my friends on the other side of the aisle don't have a single person on this side of the aisle who want children to go hungry or who want children to have a worse life than we have. I know that, but it is all about the way of getting there.

□ 1330

So there are those of us who think the best thing a person could have for their own self-respect and their own freedom and their own ability to remove themselves from the ties and chains, the strings that come with money from the government, is to get them a job. Grow the economy so they can have a job and the self-respect and the freedom that comes from that.

I know they have the best of intentions on the other side of the aisle, but I don't think that you help individuals by paying them not to work. Let's get the economy going so they can work and be free from all the strings and entanglements that come from handouts from the government.

I would never call somebody on the other side of the aisle a racist or a hater of the poor. So it gets a little disgusting when I hear that about people on my side of the aisle. We don't want anybody to suffer.

We have seen the likes of Margaret Sanger who think they know better. Get the government in charge, and then we will order people to be sterilized. And we will give you money if you will be sterilized. That is what government does.

Strings come with the money. They always do. We need the government to give out less money because people need less money because they are able to earn it for themselves with all the freedom that means. That is what we want for America. That is what the Founders wanted. And that makes for a much more free America.

In that regard, when it comes to freedom, I know the people that voted for ObamaCare thought it was going to be a great idea, even though most of them had never read it like I did. Because I could see it was a threat to all kinds of freedoms, and I could see before the vote there were provisions in there that allowed for clinics to get Federal money to provide abortion and to have insurance policies that would end up providing abortion.

So I was shocked this week at the Supreme Court. I wasn't in the courtroom. I was listening in a side room for members of the Supreme Court Bar. I was shocked to hear somebody on the Supreme Court actually take the position. Well, just pay the tax and then you can have your religious views.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Our Founders knew that. Taxation helped cause a revolution. And in fairness to the people of the District of Columbia, they are the only group who, under the Constitution, are not allowed to have a full voting Member of Congress, and who are required nonetheless to pay Federal income tax. Puerto Rico, Samoa, Mariana Islands, all of those that are territories, under the Constitution they are not entitled to a full voting Representative and do not pay Federal income tax.

Franklin made clear during the Revolution that if we do not get to elect one member of the parliament, then that parliament has no right to put taxes on us. I agree. So when Democrats were in charge, I had a bill. They wouldn't bring my bill to the floor. Now the Republicans are in the majority. They haven't so far—or our leaders haven't. I think it is only fair. They don't get to vote for a full voting Member of the House. So in fairness, the way to fix that legislatively is just to do for the District of Columbia what

we do for Puerto Rico, Guam, Samoa, and the Mariana Islands. You don't pay Federal income tax. That would be fair.

There are all kinds of things that aren't fair. But when it comes to intrusions by the government onto religious beliefs, the line cannot be drawn so that it excludes religious beliefs and the ability to practice them.

For anyone, especially a Supreme Court Justice, and even someone who worked for President Obama as Solicitor General, who said—and I am paraphrasing because she didn't say these words—I never did my job when it came to ObamaCare. I didn't talk to the administration about it. I didn't talk to them about what would help them when it came before the Supreme Court. So I didn't do my job as Solicitor General, and that is why I am qualified to be on the Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, the Senate bought that. That is the implied position. They bought that. She is on the Supreme Court. She lights into the Hobby Lobby attorney immediately. But to come around and say, Just pay the tax, then you can have your religious beliefs, you can practice your religious beliefs, it is not that expensive—what's next?

As a judge who has signed death penalty orders, I have struggled with that issue. I believe in some cases it is appropriate. I thought it was totally appropriate in Jasper, Texas, after three people were convicted of dragging an African American behind their truck. Once they had a fair trial, fair appeal, properly convicted, I wouldn't have had a problem with a law that said the victim's family gets to choose the truck and the terrain over which they drag the defendants to their deaths.

When we give the power to decide who gets to practice firmly held religious beliefs to a Supreme Court or to a 218-vote majority in the House, this Republic and the freedoms it has provided more than any Nation in history can't be much longer for the world—not those freedoms—not when Congress will stand by and allow those to be taken.

I think everybody that was here for that vote on ObamaCare knows good and well that if the intention of this government had been made clear that they were going to force people to go against firmly held Catholic beliefs, Christian beliefs, that bill would have never passed. And now they seek to enforce what would never have passed if their intentions had been made clear—it is before the Supreme Court. And who knows what they will do.

Mr. Speaker, my hopes and prayers are still for ongoing religious freedom promised under the First Amendment, and that they will not be taken away on our watch. But that kind of depends on the American people and the people they put in office and the people they allow to serve on the Supreme Court.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4152. An act to provide for the costs of loan guarantees for Ukraine.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1827. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the American Fighter Aces, collectively, in recognition of their heroic military service and defense of our country's freedom throughout the history of aviation warfare.

INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MESSEUR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the history of our country, our economic development, is predicated on our infrastructure development. Early in our history, canals, ports, postal roads, and 152 years ago, the transcontinental railroad—audacious at the time—proved to be a critical element of tying our nation together, fueling economic growth and communication.

Later, we had the interstate freeway system, which had its genesis going back over a century, nurtured in the basement of Franklin Roosevelt's White House, signed into law, and advocated by President Eisenhower.

One wonders: Could this Congress in Washington, D.C., today have produced the transcontinental railroad, the interstate highway system, provided the resources, the resolve, the research to send humans to the Moon? You have to pay for it. You have to take a risk. You have to have a plan and a design.

Sadly, it appears that that is lacking at this point.

I spent years on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, which I finally left to go to Ways and Means and to serve on the Budget Committee to try and deal with the financing issue.

In 187 days, the highway trust fund is exhausted. It is not just that the reauthorization extension expires on September 30, but we have drawn the trust fund balances down to zero. It is already starting to be felt around the country. Because you cannot manage the multibillion-dollars worth of commitments that the Federal Government has made in partnership with State and local communities and the private sector without having some range of a financial cushion, probably on the order of \$4 billion.

So that means that the Federal Government is going to start delaying the release of funding and having to choose which obligations it honors well before

September 30. That means cutting back funding this summer is going to make a difference for local communities later this spring. Already, States are dealing with this uncertainty and making decisions, putting at risk, in some cases, construction seasons.

I think we have reached the point that there are no more cans to kick over or seat cushions to reach behind. If that doesn't make sense to you, sleight of hand, to use another general fund fix.

We have transferred outright over \$50 billion to the general fund since 2008, and we have backfilled by using the Recovery Act, or the so-called stimulus funding. We made an adjustment in the Tax Code dealing with provisions for retirement benefits that were adjusted that somehow gave us a little headroom that enabled us to fund a 27-month extension.

But we are running out of these fixes, and we are not giving the certainty that the private sector, local governments, State governments, that our communities need to be able to deal with the more complicated, more expensive, longer-term projects, especially those that may involve more than one State, those that may be multimodal in nature. These expensive and complicated projects require steady, stable sources of funding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 21 years since the Federal Government last adjusted the gas tax. It was 1993. That is back when gasoline was \$1.08 a gallon. It is back when there were fewer demands in terms of the highway trust fund, when cars were less fuel-efficient.

In the course of that time, we have watched inflation eat away at the value of that 18.4 cents a gallon that people pay for their Federal gas tax, and because people are using more fuel-efficient cars and because the vehicle miles traveled have been reduced for 9 consecutive years, the amount that the individual pays per mile to support our Federal transportation infrastructure has been cut by more than 50 percent. And Congress has been dancing around this issue.

□ 1345

I have proposed that we adopt the recommendation of the Simpson-Bowles Commission that was so widely heralded 3 years ago, to have a phased 3-year increase in the gas tax.

I would note that it is supported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, by the AFL-CIO, by local governments, by transit agencies, environmentalists, by professional groups and organizations, local officials.

It is interesting that the AAA, representing auto users, and the trucking industry have both said: Federal Government, you should raise the fuel tax—not that we are wild about the fuel tax, but because the costs of not doing it are going to cost our motorists, going to cost our trucking industry and the American economy far more than the few cents per gallon that would be paid.